

bill through Congress and the two men who would carry out the mandate of the Congress . . . the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior.

While waiting in the Oval Office of the White House with these dignitaries, I recalled the statement made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt by radio to the nation in this same Oval Office about a decade earlier. At that time, President Roosevelt proclaimed that one of the post-World War II goals of the United States would be to decolonize the various territories under colonial powers around the world. As a member of the U.S. Army at the time, and as a Chamorro, I was overjoyed and encouraged. For me, it was another good reason to serve in the military during that world conflict.

Although the signing of the Guam Organic Act at the White House took place five years after the end of World War II, I thought at the time that it was the beginning of the decolonization of Guam. Unfortunately, almost half a century after the signing of the Guam Organic Act, the Chamorros are still trying to set up an island government without the bounds or restraint of colonialism.

It is our hope that before another 50 years have passed since the signing of the Guam Organic Act, we would see the passage of the Guam Commonwealth Act, now before the U.S. Congress.

I took President Roosevelt's statement about decolonization as a promise to me. I surely hope that the decolonization of Guam would happen while I'm still around.

Si Yu'os Ma'ase'.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KENDALL MEDICAL CENTER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of Kendall Medical Center, an institution which has been responsible for providing South Florida with the best medical care possible. The facility, which provides full-service, state of the art care in a wide variety of medical specialties and has nearly 100 doctors on staff, has been honored for three consecutive years as one of America's "700 Top Hospitals" and is currently "Accredited with Commendation" by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare organizations.

Among the 1,000 plus employees at Kendall Medical Center, I would like to honor the following thirteen individuals who have worked toward the evolution of Kendall Medical Center throughout the last 25 years: Teresita Beiro, Angela Carrodegus, Rosa Cerulia, Marta Cortes, Rosa Crespo, Elizabeth Mirone, Jo An Plumlee, James Rosenzweig, Elizabeth Sollogub, Patricia Stiers, Nancy Tablada, Judith Williams and Victor Maya.

Victor, whom I have known for many years, has been with the hospital since its inception and has served as its Chief Executive Officer since 1987. It has been through his leadership, vision, and determination, combined with the efforts of his employees, which have led to the outstanding achievements of Kendall Medical Center.

On the date of its 25th anniversary, I extend my thanks and my congratulations to those 13 individuals who have dedicated their lives to a quarter of a century of continuous care. You

have provided South Florida with an excellent medical facility.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, On August 6, 1998, I was not present to vote on rollcall vote 403 because of a pressing family matter in my home State of Delaware. Had I been here, I would have voted "no" on the Doolittle substitute.

When we started this debate, there were many sound proposals on how to improve our current framework of campaign finance. However, only one of these proposals has emerged as a realistic approach to significantly improve our election system.

My opposition to this substitute does not reflect a negative opinion of the author's hard work or ideas, but rather my opinion that the Shays-Meehan bill is the best method for reform.

Reformers who want to see significant changes to our election system signed into law must rally around the one bill that has the best chance of passing—that bill is the Shays-Meehan substitute.

DOMESTIC KAOLIN COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1998

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce the "Domestic Kaolin Competitiveness Act of 1998." This legislation will revise the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (The Jones Act) to ensure that laws meant to protect U.S. shipbuilding jobs will not hurt U.S. kaolin jobs.

Currently, the Jones Act requires all shipping between U.S. ports to be conducted exclusively by American built, owned, and crewed vessels. However, it does not apply to import/export shipments.

My legislation specifically targets the domestic shipping of kaolin, a fine clay found primarily in middle Georgia. Kaolin is used in a variety of industrial applications, such as producing the glossy finish on magazines, as well as the manufacture of porcelain products.

Currently, there are no American barges available that are suitable for shipping kaolin. Accordingly, Georgia clay producers are forced to use more expensive truck and rail transportation to supply American manufacturing customers, giving Brazilian kaolin producers a price edge in delivered costs. Mr. Speaker, when it is less expensive to transport kaolin from Brazil to Maine than it is from Georgia to Maine, something is not right.

This legislation would allow kaolin producers to request a waiver of the Jones Act, but only if there are no available American barges to transport the clay. In other words, if there are American barges available, clay producers would still be required to use them in order to ship by water, regardless of the price.

Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of allowing federal regulations to strangle domestic industries, while granting de factor waivers to foreign competitors. It is also a case in point of the need for Congress to review past legislation to determine if it is still accomplishing the goals it was originally intended to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the kaolin industry is put on equal footing and can compete fairly with its foreign competitors.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kucinich amendment.

Some of my colleagues oppose this amendment because they believe it is a fig leaf for protectionist impulses. Others support the amendment because they believe it is necessary to preserve basic American values from encroachment by an evil international trade bureaucracy.

These attitudes are typical of the way we debate trade in this town. We choose up sides, either as "free traders" or as "economic nationalists," and throw epithets.

But it's never that simple.

This amendment raises a legitimate issue. We visited this issue during negotiations on the World Trade Organization. A major impact of the creation of the WTO was that the United States, and all of the other members, lost what was in essence a veto power over decisions of WTO trade panels. At the time, we raised questions about the relationship between federal and state law in the context of our membership in this trade organization.

This amendment focuses on the impact of the WTO on state efforts. These are not simple issues with simple answers. They deserve our thorough and thoughtful consideration.

But an amendment to a funding bill does not provide an appropriate forum for this reasoned discussion. The implication of the amendment is that state laws affecting trade and international trade agreements are immune from action by federal authorities. While there has never been such federal action in the past, it is not wise—without very serious discussion—to immunize state laws, whatever their nature, from any such challenge in the future. Would our next step be to prohibit the use of federal funds to implement the decision of a WTO dispute settlement panel perceived to be adverse to federal laws? Doing so nullifies our prerogatives for involvement in trade organizations.

I took a lead position in trying to raise and resolve issues of interaction between WTO decisions and our federal and state laws when